

REMARKS

INTRODUCTION

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 1, 2, 6, 8-10, 13, 14, 16-18, 21, and 22 have been amended, and new claims 31-34 have been added. No new matter is being presented, and approval and entry are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-3, 6-10, 13-18, 21-23, 30, and 31-34 are pending and under consideration. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102

In the Office Action at pages 3-4, the Examiner rejects claims 1, 2, 8-10, 15, and 16 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,505,347 to Knowles, et al.. Claims 1, 8, and 16 are independent claims. This rejection is traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Knowles, et al. merely teaches an interactive program guide system for providing different television programming and different interactive program guides to several different users. According to Knowles, et al., access to a database is granted if a password is correctly input based on the password information managed in the database center. If the password is incorrectly input, an error screen is displayed. Additionally, a new password can be "established by repeatedly entering the same incorrect password a certain number of times, and at the end of the process confirming the newly established password." Knowles, et al. at col. 12, lines 57-60. Further, according to Knowles, et al., the data stored in the database are input by the person who sets the password.

Amended independent claim 1 recites, in relevant part, "a processing part configured to detect a password input error and to register information identifying the information processing apparatus by making a transmission to a first database of a registration center when the password input error is detected, and to store transmission log information related to the transmission to the registration center into said storage unit." Amended independent claim 8 recites, in relevant part, "detecting a password error at the information processing apparatus" and "registering information identifying the information processing apparatus by making a transmission to a first database of a registration center when the password input error is detected." Amended independent 16 recites, in relevant part, "causing the computer to detect a password input error" and "causing the computer to register information identifying the computer by making a transmission to a first database of the registration center when the password input error is detected." Support for these amendments to the independent claims can be found in the

originally filed Specification, at least at page 13, lines 1-9. Thus, according to the present invention, the first registration to the database is triggered by a password input error and the information registered includes information identifying the processing apparatus from which the incorrect password was submitted. Log information is not stored until a password input error is detected. Further, the password input error is detected at the information processing apparatus, and the password information is not managed in the database (registration) center.

At page 2, the outstanding Office Action asserts that Knowles, et al. at col. 12, lines 60-63 teaches registering "information of the information processing apparatus by making a transmission to a first database of a registration center when the password input error is detected, and to store transmission log information related to the transmission to the registration center into said storage unit." Applicant respectfully disagrees. As noted above, the independent claims have been amended to clarify that the "information of the information processing apparatus" is "information identifying the information processing apparatus," as recited in the amended independent claims. While Knowles, et al. is asserted to teach a transmission log, Applicant notes that col. 12, lines 60-63 state only that "The date and time of the last time that the password was used is recorded and, as shown in block 397, that date and time for the previous log is then displayed." Knowles, et al. fails to teach or suggest that any information regarding the processing apparatus from which an incorrect password is input is transmitted, recorded, or displayed. For at least this reason, Applicant respectfully submits that Knowles, et al. fails to teach or suggest all of the claimed features of amended independent claims 1, 8, and 16 and, therefore, amended independent claims 1, 8, and 16, and those claims depending directly or indirectly therefrom, patentably distinguish over the prior art and are in condition for allowance.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103

In the outstanding Office Action at pages 4-7, the Examiner rejects claims 3, 6, 7, 13, 14, 17, 18, and 21-23 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Knowles, et al. Of these claims, only claims 6, 13, and 21 are independent claims. This rejection is traversed and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

As claim 3 depends indirectly from amended independent claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 3 patentably distinguishes over the prior art for at least the same reasons as amended independent claim 1.

Independent claim 6 is directed to an information processing apparatus and has been amended to recite "a first database configured to register information identifying a first apparatus, including model information, when notified of a password input error at the first apparatus, in response to a transmission from the first apparatus," "a second database configured to register the information identifying the first apparatus when the information identifying the first apparatus is requested by a second apparatus and the information identifying the first apparatus is registered in said first database, in response to a transmission from the second apparatus," and "a processing part configured to control registration of information to and deletion of information from said first database and said second database." Independent claims 13 and 21 recite similar features. The remaining rejected claims, claims 7, 14, 17, 18, 22, and 23 depend either directly or indirectly from these independent claims.

In the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner asserts that Knowles, et al. discloses all of the features of independent claim 6, "except for a first database which records the entry of an incorrect password and a second database for recording the occurrence of the entry of an incorrect password." Similar rejections were articulated for independent claims 13 and 21. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Independent claim 6 has been amended to recite "a first database configured to register information identifying a first apparatus when notified of a password input error at the first apparatus, in response to a transmission from the first apparatus," and "a second database configured to register the information identifying the first apparatus when the information identifying the first apparatus is requested by a second apparatus and the information identifying the first apparatus is registered in said first database, in response to a transmission from the second apparatus". Applicant respectfully submits that Knowles, et al. fails to teach or suggest that any information regarding the processing apparatus from which an incorrect password is input is transmitted, recorded, or displayed. For at least this reason, Applicant respectfully submits that Knowles, et al. fails to teach or suggest all of the claimed features of amended independent claims 6, 13, and 21 and, therefore, amended independent claims 6, 13, and 21, and those claims depending directly or indirectly therefrom, patentably distinguish over the prior art and are in condition for allowance.

NEW CLAIMS 31-34

New dependent claims 31-34 have been added to set forth the invention in varying scope. Applicant respectfully submits that these claims patentably distinguish over the prior art for at least those reasons as the independent claims from which they depend.

CONCLUSION

In accordance with the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all outstanding objections and rejections have been overcome and/or rendered moot. And further, that all pending claims patentably distinguish over the prior art. Thus, there being no further outstanding objections or rejections, the application is submitted as being in condition for allowance which action is earnestly solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters. If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this amendment, please charge the same to our deposit account no. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 17 January 2006

By: 
Allison Olenginski
Registration No. 55,509

1201 New York Ave, N.W., Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501